

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2004/0237104 to Cooper et al. ("Cooper").

Applicants note that the Examiner has not addressed claim 20.

Applicants have amended claims 1, 13, and 18, and claims 1-20 are pending in this application.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Applicants continue to assert that the teachings in Cooper relied upon by the Examiner are not present in Provisional Application No. 60/337,473, filed on November 10, 2001. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended claims 1, 13, and 18 to further distinguish Cooper.

Claim 1 recites a system including, for example:

the first display device . . .  
the second display device includes a display unit for displaying display information for operation including a base device selection button and a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes and accepting an operating input from a user, an operating input accepting means for accepting an operating input from a user, an operating signal generating means for generating operating signals conforming to display items of the display information for operation as specified by the operating input accepting means, and a communication means for transmitting the operating signals to the base device; and

...

---

<sup>1</sup> The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

(emphasis added). Cooper does not disclose at least the claimed “second display device.”

Cooper discloses a “PVR that allows the user to select one or more encoding formats for recording a selected program” (paragraph 0006). The Examiner states that mobile device 25 corresponds to the claimed “second display device” (Office Action at page 3). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Mobile device 25 “can control actions by the PVR 26” including selecting which programs to record, requesting transfer of television programs, and acting as a substitute for the remote control device 12 of PVR 26 (paragraph 0025). However, mobile device 25 does not include a “display unit for displaying display information for operation including a base device selection button and a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes.” In addition, the provisional application, the disclosure of which the Examiner relies on to predate Applicants priority filing date, is silent regarding the claimed “second display device.”

Accordingly, Cooper does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, “the second display device includes a display unit for displaying display information for operation including a base device selection button and a plurality of additional buttons for switching image modes and accepting an operating input from a user,” as recited in claim 1.

Cooper fails to anticipate claim 1, and claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2-12 and 20 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 1. Independent claims 13 and 18 and dependent claims 14-17 and 19 are allowable over Cooper for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-20 in condition for allowance. This Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully point out that the Final Office Action by the Examiner presented some new arguments as to the application of the art against Applicants' invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicants to reply to the final rejection and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants submit that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: October 10, 2008

By: /David W. Hill/  
David W. Hill  
Reg. No. 28,220